



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/476,141	01/03/2000	RAYMOND GUZMAN	241/288	7365

23639 7590 06/03/2003

BINGHAM, MCCUTCHEN LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO, SUITE 1800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-4067

EXAMINER

ALAM, SHAHID AL

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2172

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

JUN 03 2003

Technology Center 2100

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Paper No. 11

Application Number: 09/476,141
Filing Date: January 03, 2000
Appellant(s): GUZMAN ET AL.

Oracle Corporation
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed on February 19, 2003.

(1) *Real Party in Interest*

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences*

The brief does not contain a statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief. Therefore, it is presumed that there are none. The Board, however, may exercise its discretion to require an explicit statement as to the existence of any related appeals and interferences.

(3) *Status of Claims*

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) *Status of Amendments After Final*

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) *Summary of Invention*

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Issues

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) Grouping of Claims

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 33 – 36, 39, 40 – 44, 47, 49 – 52, and 55 stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

(8) Claims Appealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) Prior Art of Record

The Following is a listing of the prior art of record relied upon in the rejection of claims under appeal.

6,275,824	O'Flaherty et al.	08-2001
-----------	-------------------	---------

(10) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 33 – 36, 39, 41 – 22, 47, 49 – 52, and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

102(e).

Art Unit: 2172

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 33 – 36, 39, 41 – 44, 47, 49 – 52 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,275,824 issued to Kenneth W. O'Flaherty et al. (hereinafter "O'Flaherty").

With respect to claims 33, 41 and 49, O'Flaherty teaches a process for accessing a virtual table comprising:

identifying a data source (The data source may be the customer, or may be a third party intermediary source, see column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 1);

associating a record within said data source to a virtual table, said virtual table is not defined with database metadata (column 4, lines 13 – 27 and column 10, line 66 – column 11, line 2);

accessing said record (the data itself is stored in a persistent base table and the view's rows are derived from that base table, see column 4, lines 24 – 26); and

logically populating said virtual table with said record (SQL statements are used to pull appropriate rows to populate the result table (view) from the base table, see column 7, lines 60 – 63; Appellant's "logically populating" implies here is displaying or logically accessing).

As to claims 34, 42 and 50, said record is accessed based upon data description information for said record (data from the base table are retrieved to the view based upon content of some column, see column 8, lines 16 – 23).

As to claims 35, 43 and 51, a user-defined function is used to access said virtual table (shows the data (information) that is analyzed or retrieved comes from a virtual table, see column 8, line 62 – column 9, line 1).

As to claims 36, 44 and 52, identifying a second data source (the examiner considers Third Party APPS (112) or Business APPS (110) in Figure 10 as the second data source. The data source may be the customer or may be a third party intermediary source, see column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 1);

associating a second record within said second data source to a virtual table (The examiner considers Figure 3A as the second virtual table. When a record is retrieved from a data view, actual records are derived from the base table to the virtual table. see also column 4, lines 18 – 28);

accessing said second record (the data itself is stored in a persistent base table and the view's rows are derived from that base table, see column 4, lines 24 – 26); and

logically populating said virtual table with said second record (SQL statements are used to pull appropriate rows (first row or second row or any other row) to populate

Art Unit: 2172

the result table (view) from the base table, see Figure 3 and also column 7, lines 60 - 63).

As to claims 39, 47 and 55, a data manipulation operation is performed against said virtual table (while other views materialize entire tables before narrowing down the data to the view subset, TERADATA generates SQL that selectively pulls appropriate columns and rows into the result table, see column 7, lines 60 – 63).

(11) *Response to Argument*

Issues regarding the rejections of claims 33 – 36, 39, 41 – 44, 47, 49 – 52 and 55:

Claim 33 is representative of the rejected claims. Claim 33 recites, “associating a record within said data source to a virtual table, wherein said virtual table is not defined with database metadata.”

Appellants’ Arguments regarding the rejections of claims 33 – 36, 39, 41 – 44, 47, 49 – 52 and 55:

Argument: “Not only do the cited passages not disclose associating a record within said data source to a virtual table, wherein said virtual table is not defined with database metadata as recited in claim 33, the first cited passage actually teaches the exact opposite.” (Page 5, lines 23 – 25).

Examiner’s response to the Argument:

One important capability of a database management system is the ability to define a virtual table and save that definition in the database as metadata with a user-defined name. A virtual table can be created without using any metadata from a source

Art Unit: 2172

table. According to O'Flaherty virtual table's metadata can have user defined name which are different from source table metadata. Therefore, a virtual table does not have to be defined with database metadata. For example: if source table have two columns, one is the number of hours worked and other one is the rate per hour. A virtual table can made having a column called "Pay" which can be the result of source table's number of hours worked times rate columns. Thus, virtual table's metadata do not have to be defined within the source table metadata. Source table defined by the Appellant can easily be created from other source table and then virtual table can be created from new source table.

Therefore, the teaching, "One important capability of a database management system is the ability to define a virtual table and save that definition in the database as metadata with a user-defined name. The object formed by this operation is known as a View or a database view (the particular database views used in the present invention are hereinafter referred to as "dataviews"). As a virtual table, a dataview is not physically materialized anywhere in the database until it is needed. All accesses to data, (with the possible exception of data access for administrative purposes) is accomplished through dataviews. To implement a variety of privacy rules, a suite of a plurality of dataviews is provided. Metadata about the privacy dataviews (including the dataview name, names and data types of the dataview columns, and the method by which the rows are to be derived) is stored persistently in the databases metadata, but the actual data presented by the view is not physically stored anywhere in association with the derived table. Instead, the data itself is stored in a persistent base table, and the view's rows are derived from that base table. Although the dataview is a virtual

Art Unit: 2172

table, operations can be performed against dataviews just as they can be performed against the base tables" of O'Flaherty (column 4, lines 7 – 28) meets the limitation "associating a record within said data source to a virtual table, wherein said virtual table is not defined with database metadata."

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,



Shahid Al Alam
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2172

S.A.
June 2, 2003

Conferees *MTA*
Hosain T. Alam
Jean M. Corrielus *ALL*

LYON & LYON LLP
633 WEST FIFTH STREET
SUITE 4700
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071